

## CONNECTIONALITY SUMMARY

## EVASION OF LAW BY THE POSTAL AU-

**Efforts to Avoid Payment of Sums Due—**  
Further Interesting Discussion in the  
Senate Upon the Interstate Commerce  
Bill.

In the Senate yesterday a resolution was offered by Mr. Ingalls directing the Postmaster General to report to the Senate all the cases of unadjusted salaries of postmasters and late postmasters in Kansas, under the act of March 3, 1853, with a statement showing the amount of pay each postmaster would have received if paid upon the basis of commissions under the act of 1854, and the amount of salary allowed and paid under the act of July 1, 1864; also the amount allowed under the act of March 3, 1853, and the period of service for which such allowance was made, such statement

Mr. Conger moved to amend by extending the inquiry to all cases, instead of confining it to the state of Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Riddleberger wanted to add an inquiry as to how many of our so-called "moral reformers" were in the army.

Mr. Ingalls thought that such an inquiry should be made the subject of a separate resolution, and Mr. Riddleberger withdrew it.

Mr. McPherson thought the inquiry as broad and comprehensive that it should be preceded by a bill authorizing the Postmaster General to employ a sufficient force of clerks to furnish the information called for. He thought it was better to have a bill.

Mr. Ingalls thought not. It did not cover all postmasters, but those only who were affected by the law of 1883. That law, said, had been evaded by the authorities. The officers of the department had made an effort to avoid payment of what could justly be claimed under that law.

Mr. Platt said that injustice had been done to postmasters in Connecticut in the matter of this readjustment of their compensation. He feared they would most of them be dead before their accounts were

Mr. Ingalls' resolution, as amended by Mr. Conger, was agreed to.

The Interstate commerce bill was placed before the Senate.

Mr. Ingalls' proposed amendment was agreed to, giving to the commission the right to report to the United States circuit court and get its speedy judgment on complaints whenever the companies decline to obey the order of the commission.

Mr. Walthall addressed the Senate on the

features it did not meet his approval, yet he would vote for it as a first step in legislation on this important subject. Even if it were proven that railroad companies were not lawfully oppressing the people, he would still support any reasonable congressional measure looking to their control and control. He would do so because of the undeniable fact that such oppression, in the absence of legal restraint, was possible and that no adequate protection could be afforded by state law. Every interest in the country was dependent on the railroads. Agriculture and commerce were especially at their mercy. With all this vast power in the hands of the railroad corporation a man could give a valid reason why a whole

An amendment offered by Mr. Conger was agreed to, modifying the first section of the bill, which relates to the class of companies to which the bill is made applicable. In the case of common carriers whose routes are partly by railroad and partly by water, when both are used for continuous passage, or shipment, from one station to another, Mr. Conger's amendment limits the bill to such of those companies as are "under a common control."

Mr. Conger said the American people have spent millions of dollars to improve rivers and harbors and in attempts to maintain water competition against railroads. If his amendment were not adopted, those millions might as well have been thrown into the sea.

Considerable debate arose between Messrs. Back, Aldrich, Wilson, of Iowa; Brown, of New York; Sewell, of New York; and Gorman as to the effect of the bill in its present amended condition and as to

Mr. Gorman in the course of his remarks said that Mr. Ingalls' suggestion as to the interest of the Baltimore and Ohio railroad was an entire mistake. The bill would not prove to be in the interest of that road nor would the Camden amendment.

Mr. Stanford, in the course of his remarks made in reply to Mr. Beck and to some question of Mr. Van Wyck, said that the hardest contention which the Pacific rail-

Speaking of the bill as a whole, Mr. Stanford said, with emphasis, that if passed it meant complete commercial disaster. In reply to a question by Mr. Van Wyck as to whether the Pacific roads had not, at a time stated, controlled the Pacific Mail Steamship line by paying it \$1,000,000 a year

said the railroads had chartered so many tons in those ships and paid them some amount for them—not so much as has been stated—and filled them with such freight

Mr. Sewell said if the bill became a law with the Camden amendment in it it would

At 5:30 p. m., on motion of Mr. Edmund without further action on the bill, the Senate adjourned.

—

**THE HOUSE.**

Under the usual Monday call of state the House received a large number of bills.

was devoted to the consideration of business relating to the affairs of the District of Columbia, which proceedings are published in another part of this paper. At 4:40 the

### Return of the President.

The President returned from his visit to the stock farm of Representative Scott, on the shore of the Chesapeake bay, last evening at 6 o'clock, and was busily engaged during the evening with Col. Lamont on official business.

The complimentary dinner to Mr. E. Knight brings to the minds of railroad men the fact that he is the originator of the system of sleeping car lines.

Mr. Van Wyck introduced in the Senate bill to authorize the Union Pacific Railroad Company to use its credit for the purpose

United States fish commission car No. 116  
 Havre de Grace, Md., Sunday with 1,500,000  
 shad for the Broad and Saluda rivers, South  
 Carolina, and with 1,500,000 shad for Portland  
 Oreg., for stocking the Columbia river basin.

The answer of the Philadelphia and Reading  
 Coal and Iron Company to the bill for

The Supreme Court of the United States yesterday affirmed the decision of the lower court in the California railroad tax cases, which was in favor of the railroads. The suit was against the Southern and Central Pacific Railroad Companies and the case comes under provisions

on. The railroad contented itself with in property had been discriminated against in making appraisements for tax purposes and refused to pay the taxes levied.

100